

aggressive atheism in excelsis; he likewise finds much hope and comfort in the attacks of the anti-Christian press on 'the Romish authorities' in Spain, and in the fact that in Italy 'high dignitaries of the Roman Church' have been 'subjected to rough treatment' by organised gangs of the enemies of religious faith and of public order.

The ground of comfort that the Rev. Dr. Hanson finds in these signs of what he calls 'the Continental awakening' is a very shadowy one indeed. He hopes that this atheist war on the great organisation which he designates by the offensive theological slang nickname, the 'Romish' Church, will open 'the way' for aggressive missionary enterprise by his co-religionists. But, in the first place, while in France Catholicism is rising to the occasion and acquiring new life and strength and hope from persecution, the Reformed Churches in that country (which have long been in a state of marked decadence) are in worse case than ever. It looks as if the Rev. Doctor is one of those who are satisfied to see a neighbor's house on fire, as it affords them a cheap opportunity of roasting their eggs. In the second place, 'aggressive missionary enterprise' by Reformed creeds in Catholic countries has been hopelessly barren, even when backed by overflowing coffers. In the third place it strikes us that the suggested 'aggressive missionary enterprise' might very advantageously begin at home—and that one of its first and most urgently needed functions should be to convert to Christianity the considerable number of the clergy of the Reformed denominations who have shuffled off belief in many of the fundamental tenets of Christ's Revelation. And finally: One of the most stirring and beautiful incidents in the life of Chatham was the burst of indignant eloquence with which he thundered in the British Parliament against Burgoyne's employment of the Indian with his scalping-knife as an ally of England against her children in America. A Christian minister should be as much ashamed to accept French and other Continental atheists, with their savage methods of warfare against religion, as allies in a religious crusade, or as the John the Baptists or forerunners of a campaign of 'aggressive missionary enterprise'. Non tali auxilio!

Here is a droll paragraph from the article in question:—

'In Australia the Los von Risca movement continues, through which more than 50,000 persons have left the Church of Rome in six or seven years.'

This will be news indeed for people on the other side of the Tasman Sea! We are, however, very much inclined to think that the first line of the quoted paragraph is really intended as a description, not of some unknown 'Los von Risca' movement in Australia, but of the abortive and treasonable political movement in Austria which was known as the 'los von Rom'. This anti-patriotic agitation arose in 1899 out of a Bill which prescribed that the German language—which was most commonly in use as the official tongue—should be replaced by Czech, where that was the common language of the people. The feelings of the German element rose to fever heat, and scandalous scenes were enacted in the Austrian Reichsrath or Parliament. The so-called Catholic party (who were German-speaking) held the balance of power, and supported the Bill. Their act of common fairness on their part set the Germanising party frantic. These urged that Protestantism was equivalent to Germanism, and organised what purported to be a 'movement' 'los von Rom' (i.e., away from Rome). Some 'damaged goods'—bad or indifferent Catholics—made a 'show' of 'conversion'; and the figures of 'converts' were exaggerated in a way that far surpassed the story of Shakespeare's rogues in buckram. Money was poured in from Germany to support the movement, which soon devel-

oped into a treasonable conspiracy to enlarge the boundaries of the Fatherland by the absorption or 'benevolent assimilation' of Austria. From start to finish the movement was a political one. Dr. Johanny, one of the most respected Evangelical ministers in Vienna, declared at the time, in the course of a newspaper article, that the leaders of the movement were men who laughed at the Bible. 'The Evangelical Church', said he in conclusion, 'can have no share in efforts which, under the motto of "emancipation from Rome", converts apostasy into a political demonstration'. 'It is impossible', added he, 'that an Austrian can look in a sympathetic manner upon a movement so unpatriotic and irreligious in its origin'. However, that is all of the dead and buried past. The 'movement' (such as it was) soon died away. And the condemnation of two of its leaders for serious crimes against morality gave it its coup de grace. Had such a conspiracy taken place in Germany or England, its ringleaders would have received a short shrift and a long drop—with Jack Ketch's Manila cravat around their traitorous necks.

SOCIALISM

ITS PURPOSE; AN IMPORTANT QUESTION; PROBLEMS OF PRODUCTION; TASK OF THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY

(Continued from last week.)

Socialism, then, seeks to overthrow the present order of society and to establish an entirely new order in its place.

At present the wealth of the world is held by individual owners. Each one of us is a 'capitalist,' as it is called, in a greater or lesser degree. In the Socialist State there would be no individual capitalists. *The whole of the capital would be held by the State—that is, by all the people who constitute the organism called a State.* Although, on the one hand (roughly speaking), no one would own anything, on the other, every one would own everything. That is the principle of *collective ownership*. Thus, the whole of the land, the mines, the quarries, the workshops and the factories, with all machinery, tools, and all other instruments for producing articles, would be owned by the State, which would be the sole producer and manufacturer, and also the sole distributor or shopkeeper. All railways, steamboats, and means of transport would therefore also be held by the State. The State would have to determine what kind of articles and how much of them are to be produced or manufactured; how these goods are to be distributed, and the proportions in which they are to be distributed. No private individual would be allowed to produce anything except as a State laborer or for his own personal use.¹ That is the first principle of Socialism as expounded on the Continent and in America and England to-day. 'The collective ownership of all the means of production.' That is why Socialists usually call themselves Collectivists. Now, let us get clearly into our minds, even at the cost of repetition, what this means. The State—that is, the whole community of individuals who compose it—are to be the joint owners, each one as much as the other, of *all* the instruments of production, distribution, and exchange. Land, with all that it produces and supports, mines, minerals, all the raw materials of use and commerce, all the factories and workshops, all the tools and implements—everything that can be produced or manufactured, and everything that can be used in producing or manufacturing, will belong to the State; that is, equally to every man, woman, and child composing it. There will be *no* private property in the sense we know of it; or at most only to a limited extent—that is, to such extent as is comprised in the possibility of personal use.

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION.

Now, before we go any further, let us ask this question, a rather important one—How is the State to become possessed

¹ By Socialism is meant 'the establishment of a political power—in place of the present class State—which shall have for its conscious and definite aim the common ownership and control of the *whole* of the world's industry, exchange, etc.—*Catechism of Socialism*, Bax and Quelch, p. 5.